Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety

Centre canadien d'hygiène et de sécurité au travail

Training and Education in Chemical Information:

A Workshop

P87-10E

87-05353/

Canadian Centre
for Occupational Health
and Safety

Training and Education in Chemical Information:

A Workshop

Hamilton, Ontario

March 18, 1987

Canadian Centre
for Occupational Health
and Safety

TRAINING AND EDUCATION IN CHEMICAL INFORMATION:

A WORKSHOP

CCOHS NUMBER P87-10E

ISBN 0-660-12549-8

DSS CATALOGUE NUMBER CC273-2/87-10E

This publication is available
in both official languages.

Cette publication est disponible
dans les deux langues officielles.

Each document produced by the Centre undergoes several stages of review. As a part of this review, representatives from each of government, employers, and labour are requested to comment on draft copies of CCOHS documents for technical accuracy and usability.

Although every effort is made to ensure accuracy and completeness of the information, it is understood that the Centre makes no warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of such information and assumes no liability for any damages or loss suffered as a result of any inaccuracy or incompleteness therein.

Published 1987

Additional copies available upon request.

250 Main Street East
Hamilton, Ontario
L8N 1H6
(416) 572-2981
Telex 061-8532

On March 12 and 13, the Centre facilitated a workshop, "Training and Education in Chemical Information" at the Hamilton Convention Centre.

Background

Right-to-know legislation, and in particular, the impending implementation of WHMIS, was causing people in labour and industry to consider training needs in chemical information.

Growing concerns about the safety of chemicals, legislative right-to-know strategies, and effective training and education to implement these strategies led to a request to the Centre to facilitate a workshop. Of particular concern were adequacy of training, acceptability of training, and fear of duplication that would lead to a great deal of work, a great deal of expense, and perhaps less than quality programs.

The objective of the workshop was to develop labour and management consensus on training and education in chemical information, focusing on content of program, delivery of program, access and retrieval to training materials.

The Centre worked with the requester and a private sector consultant to prepare the program design.

The Workshop

Seventy-seven people from labour, management, and government, with training responsibilities, attended the workshop. Gordon Atherley welcomed the participants to the Centre-facilitated workshop, outlined the process, and offered to have the Centre prepare and publish the proceedings, and wished the participants successful deliberations. Lillian Vine, Manager, Workshops and Committees chaired the plenary sessions.

Opening addresses by Cliff Pilkey, former President, Ontario Federation of Labour and Jean Bélanger, President, Canadian Chemical Producers' Association, examined the implications of right-to-know legislation on training in chemical information from the points of view of labour and management respectively. Cliff Pilkey warned that serious steps were needed to ensure that workers had appropriate training to work in conditions as safe and healthy as possible; Jean Bélanger assured the audience that the chemical industry was indeed taking its responsibility seriously and making plans to ensure that workers were adequately informed and trained.

The participants met in tripartite work sessions to discuss the three areas of the workshop—content, delivery and access and retrieval. The workgroups were chaired by:

The Workshop
continued

Group 1 - Deborah Smith, Senior Occupational Hygienist, Alberta Community and Occupational Health;

Group 2 - Bill Denault, Director, BC Construction Industry Health and Safety Council;

Group 3 - John Henry, Science Supervisor, Hamilton Board of Education;

Group 4 - Clarence MacPherson, Executive Director, Ontario Workers' Occupational Safety and Health Centre; and

Group 5 - Daniel Ublansky, Legislative and Health Co-ordinator, Energy and Chemical Workers Union.

At the final plenary, rapporteurs from each group reported the results of discussion.

There were many areas of agreement and some areas of concerns still needing to be addressed.

Generally agreed were:

- Commitment and motivation of both management and labour are essential for successful training.
- Training should be results-oriented—it should make a difference in the workplace.
- Joint design and delivery of training materials, will produce results, through a sense of ownership.
- Training should be participative and adaptive to the workplace.
- Core and generic materials can and should be developed and widely available throughout Canada. A central repository of materials would be useful. There is a need for coordination of training materials in chemical information.

Content and quantity of materials were also a matter of wide agreement. The criteria were:

- Accuracy, completeness, accessibility, and currency of information at the appropriate literacy level.
- This included an understanding of legislation, MSDSs and how to use them, basic knowledge of hazards, how to identify them, what to do about them, health and synergistic effects.

The Workshop
continued

- It was considered vital to have job-specific information about products and procedures for safe use under normal circumstances and in emergency situations.

- There was strong support for the certification of trainers and little support for certification of workers, but general support of recognition of training achieved by workers.

Areas still needing to be addressed were:

- The role of government in training and information—this varied from no role to full participation.

- There was concern about the ability of small enterprises to deliver quality training programs. It was thought that government might have a role in assisting through funding or facilitation.

The overall reaction to the workshop was highly positive. Many participants commented that the workshop had provided a significant opportunity—their first—to, with their counterparts in labour or management or government, openly and seriously consider and reach concensus on important issues. While a few would have preferred the Centre to provide training models, most found the exchange of ideas and experiences and working through problems around a well-planned framework a valuable and valid process for reaching acceptable principles.

The Canadian Centre
for Occupational Health and Safety

is facilitating a Workshop

TRAINING AND EDUCATION IN CHEMICAL INFORMATION

March 12, 9 am to March 13, 1987 at 12:30 pm
Hamilton Convention Centre, Hamilton, Ontario

Throughout the workshop, there will be a publications display and demonstrations of technological information systems relevant to training – Albion Room A & B.

PARTICIPANT AGENDA

Thursday, March 12, 1987

9:00 am	Welcome and Introduction to the Workshop Dr Gordon Atherley, President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety – Albion Room A & B	
9:15 am	**Plenary: Panel – Right to know legislation – training implications**	
	Labour:	Cliff Pilkey, former President, Ontario Federation of Labour
	Management:	Jean Bélanger, President, Canadian Chemical Producers' Association
	Chairman:	Lillian Vine, Manager, Committees and Workshops, Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety
	Open discussion	
10:15 am	Break	

10:30 am

Workshop #1
Content of an Education and Training Program — Task: Define what labour and management would expect the quantity of information to be in a chemical information training program

- Discuss what is needed to be known
- Discuss what would be wanted or "nice to know"
- Workplace specific information—what is required?
- What general topics should be included?
- What are the specific key topics?
- Do they apply to small and large workplaces?

12:15 pm — Lunch – Chedoke Room B, 3rd Floor

1:30 pm

Workshop #2
Delivery of an Educational and Training Program — Task: Define what labour and management would find acceptable delivery in terms of quality

- How do you define standards of quality of a program?
- Is there a need to develop recognition/certification in training programs?
- Discuss employer responsibility, worker responsibility, and joint responsibility in training
- Do governments have a role in the delivery of training programs?
- Discuss flexibility issues
- Discuss commitment issues

3:15 pm — Break – Outside Albion Room A

3:30 pm	**Workshop #3** **Access and Retrieval** -- Task: Define how labour and management expect to assemble and provide training materials in the workplace. • Should generic and workplace specific information be freely distributed throughout Canada? • Can such materials be accommodated for national use? • Can all workplaces access training materials?
6:30 pm	Buffet – Chedoke Room B, 3rd Floor A cash bar will be available

Friday, March 13, 1987

9:00 am	**Plenary: Conclusions and Recommendations** – Albion Room A & B
10:15 am	Break
12:30 pm	Close of Workshop

Welcome and Introductions

Gordon Atherley

Welcome. I am Gordon Atherley, the President of the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, and it is my pleasure on behalf of the Chairman of the Council, the Honourable Martin O'Connell, and the Centre, to welcome you to this workshop. First of all, I would like to say that simultaneous translation will be available in all the plenary sessions and I invite you to address your remarks in these sessions in the official language of your choice.

I would like to talk a little bit about the Centre by way of introduction, about the workshop process, and what we mean by facilitation. I will then launch the proceedings by handing things over to our Chief Facilitator.

The Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety is a public corporation, funded by the federal government but governed by a tripartite council. The tripartite council represents governments (federal, provincial, territorial), organized labour and employers, and it is from Council that we get our policy.

The policy is for the Centre to be the national information resource in occupational health and safety (the national service). To deliver this national service, we respond to inquiries. Through our inquiries services, we produce publications; and we developed CCINFO — the national electronic system based on computers and also based on the remarkable compact disc which is on display during the breaks. There are also other displays of equipments and materials which some of the participants have brought with them.

In our information work, we discovered people not only want information, but they also want an opportunity to discuss the issues and where the information and issues fit into their work. We found they wanted to discuss those questions among themselves with the Centre acting as information provider and facilitator; this is what we mean by a Workshop.

The workshop is an opportunity for you to discuss among yourselves matters of importance to you relating to chemical information. We have structured the discussion to create a sense of direction. The Chairman's role (there are Chairpersons for each of the groups) is to keep the momentum going and to lead you through these discussions to an end product.

The product will be whatever you choose it to be. We will print it and distribute it, in any numbers you so require (within reason) at no cost to you or to anyone or to any organization who finds it useful. In order words, our facilitation process involves helping the discussion along (your discussion) and then taking the product

Welcome and Introductions
continued

from you, editing it, having the Chairmen look at it, and then publishing it for you and others.

We have what is not exactly a long record in this because this is only the second workshop we have facilitated. The first one, which was voted by the participants a great success, was on a very tricky subject — Medical Surveillance and Human Rights. Out of this came a sense of understanding among the participants which they all felt was very helpful to them. This has been published and is available for distribution.

The facilitation process really is "us" the staff, providing the room, making sure everything functions, making sure the coffee arrives on time, being on hand to help you in any way; if there is anything to do in way of providing information, please ask—Lillian will mention a little bit more about how that might work. Our role in the end is to get the product out. Although the product has our logo all over it, it is yours, not ours. I do not mean we are disclaiming it, we are delighted to have it but it does not go as an official document. It is a product of your work in this workshop.

The point I would like to finish on is exactly that — this workshop is "you" doing the work and that's audacious because here we are, we have charged you $250 for you to come here and work, but I think you will find the process is exciting and rewarding. We would like you to think in the end this was an investment of time and resources which was well worthwhile.

Certainly our use of the information will be to assist others who are tackling the same type of problems as you tackle. Last night we drew the Chairpersons together to discuss how they were going to handle the discussion groups, and I think I sensed a rising excitement at the prospect, tinged perhaps with a little trepidation of what they might be letting themselves in for, but a very definite feeling that here was something important to everybody which they wanted to make a success of.

I wish you lots of luck, I wish you hard work, and I look forward to joining you at the buffet this evening and hearing the plenary session feedback tomorrow. With that I am going to hand over to our Facilitator-in-Chief who will lead us into the next phase which will start us rolling then into the workshop. Good luck.

Introduction of Panelists

Lillian Vine

Il me fait plaisir, à moi aussi, de vous souhaiter la bienvenue à cet atelier.

This is the only time during the day-and-a-half when you can sit back and listen to somebody else speak, although even in this session, we expect you to be involved. We have left time for you to ask questions or make comments.

We could not have chosen better the people talking about training implications of right-to-know legislation than we did. I will introduce them much more briefly than they deserve, to leave time for ample discussion.

Cliff Pilkey has been involved with labour and community for a long time. In 1967 he received the prestigious Medal of Canada for these contributions. He retired a few months ago after a ten year term as President of the Ontario Federation of Labour and from what I see in his résumé, it is an active retirement indeed.

Jean Bélanger is President of the Canadian Chemical Producers' Association. He is a Chemical Engineer whose career has spanned the field of chemicals and of federal policy development for key sectors of Canadian industry. Jean was deeply involved in the planning process for one of the important right to know legislations about to be implemented which is WHMIS (Workplace Hazardous Materials Information Systems).

Panel Presentations

Cliff, from the labour point of view — the implications of the right to know legislation.

Cliff Pilkey
Labour

It is very nice to be invited to speak at this workshop, facilitated by the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety.

Most of you know me as the former President of the Ontario Federation of Labour but a week ago, I was elected President of the Ontario Workers' Occupational Safety and Health Centre. We have worked hard to create this Centre over a number of years, and we think it is making a significant contribution to workers right across this province. Not only have we involved the affiliates to the Ontario Federation of Labour but in bringing into our meeting in Niagara-on-the-Lake, teachers, nurses, teamsters, building trades, the Ontario Workers' Occupational Safety and Health Centre will be recognized as a group representing over a million workers in the province of Ontario.

Cliff Pilkey *continued*

The topic you will be discussing is extremely important, because in many industries, not a great deal of attention or time is given to safety talks and in some, the talk is about not wearing rings, that long hair needs to be pulled back, and holiday boating safety. We should be generating safety training well beyond that because the needs of workers are not being met.

The employers (in many cases) think they are meeting the needs of the workers through these short dissertations about occupational health and safety. They not only miss the mark, but, I might add, they will also find themselves in some difficulty. Employers in this country have a legal obligation to properly train workers about workplace hazards. Pending right-to-know legislation will also compel training for all hazardous chemical substances which is the substance of your deliberations in this workshop.

Regardless of the wording each province lays out in its respective Occupational Health and Safety Act, the employer has a duty to train. And now governments are being pressured to get tough, goverarments are being pressured to actually enforce their Acts.

For instance, I do not think any of you will deny that Ontario was forced to get tough with de Havilland. I have here a bundle of paper, on each sheet an order to de Havilland for contraventions of the Act, and amongst them, an order that interprets the employer's luty to "acquaint" workers with hazards as meaning to "train" workers about hazards. The rest of the story, my friends, is considered at least by the union I represent, as the stuff of legends.

With materials pulled together from the Ontario Workers' Occupational Safety and Health Centre, and our host today, the Canadian Centre, and various suppliers of safety equipment, two and four-day quality programs were delivered to every auto worker and every manager in that plant. That, my friends, was no five-minute training.

As I understand it from Clarence MacPherson and others who assisted in this, they had to go into some sophisticated training programs—not only to address the problems there, but also to meet the requirements of the Ministry of Labour.

You can also be sure other ongoing legislated amendments will continue this trend. In Manitoba, Joint Health and Safety Committee members are now legally entitled to two days of health and safety training.

Finally, the legislative surge to train will be, or rather is, complemented by contractual surge. Workers nation-wide, have

Cliff Pilkey *continued*

identified health and safety training as a key collective bargaining objective. In the auto industry alone, unionized workers are receiving quality training by the thousands, on company time and money. Following suit, workers of the mining, public and paper sectors are also negotiating quality health and safety training.

The basis for most of these training programs can be seen just inside this room. My friends, I put it to you, employer responsibility for health and safety training is inevitable, so why wait for the axe to fall? Why wait for our hands to be forced in this manner?

South of the border, the UAW and General Motors have jointly developed a very sophisticated program to meet their obligations under their Hazardous Communication Program (the WHMIS equivalent). But there are programs which, simply put, are "a hunk of junk". I was looking at one of those, too. It is a comic book. I noticed when reading this book, it says, "work smart — take part" and "your health is in your hands". I am not persuaded that the health of the workers is really in their hands. I think it will happen one day, but I am not persuaded it is in their hands yet.

I think employers are continuing to resist that, and I think there will have to come the day when they recognize that workers must have at least an equal say in their health standards, and they should begin to recognize it and not to resist it.

Workers want, and must have more say in determining how their lives will be affected as a result of health problems because of chemical uses in the specific plants. They must have a say in determining their own destiny.

In closing, I think, I could say without fear of contradiction, workers of Canada were proud to have been part of the forging of a national consensus in WHMIS, and I assure you, they would be just as proud to help forge a national consensus on training. Thank you very much.

Jean Belanger
Employers

Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here. I represent an industry and an association which over the past years has had to face many crises ranging from economic downturns to high energy prices, from Mississauga to Bhopal. We cannot say we have lacked issues to deal with.

For me particularly, the past five years have been a journey in trust-building, as I, along with industrial representatives, came

Jean Belanger *continued*

to the common recognition that what was driving us all (government, labour and industry) throughout those five years, was a community of commitment to have a safe workplace. This same commitment must be what brings us to this table and workshop today.

I recognize, in many forms, we have defined WHMIS as a very carefully crafted balance between the right-to-know and the right to intellectual property. This is true, but it is extremely important also to be very aware that industry representatives have always stressed (and in this we received the full support of our association and its membership) that such protection of property should never extend to health effect, in fact, successive drafts of regulations clearly have stated that there have never been any arguments about it amongst the parties.

The names of certain ingredients have been undisclosed at times, but we must never hide the fact that a certain product may be a carcinogen or a lung sensitizer or an irritant. What this calls for, therefore, on the part of management, is an attitude of openness, a spirit that is dominated by how little we really need to protect confidentially as opposed to what others are going to drag out of us. That spirit of openness is a commitment which has been made by our chemical industry, and this is not only a reactive one, one which is forced upon us by regulations. We have also taken a major proactive stance through the public development of our Responsible Care program.

I would like to give a little bit of history of the program because I think it is indicative of how aspects of right-to-know have come about. In the late 1970's we took some pride in being known as what is called "the invisible industry". In other words, we worked behind the scenes, and there is so much which comes from the chemical industry. Somebody told us, however, around 1980 that it was very nice to be an invisible industry but the problem was that at the time, we did not have the support of the constituencies. In fact, it was a very good forecast because when things started to go wrong, we found the industry was not trusted, was not open, was not caring. These were the opinions in the public. We also recognized that building trust did not come by just saying, "We are good" or saying, "Look at all the benefits we create". It meant we had to do good and be open.

As a result of this recognition, every Chief Executive Officer in our association (every top person in the chemical operation of companies) has individually signed a statement of responsible care. It is important because his neck is now out very directly and, everybody on the management side and all the employees have

Jean Belanger *continued*

to know his neck is out. That is a general statement, but it is a sensitization statement which was made, and we recognized it.

People need to know the dangers of what they are working with as well as the dangers of what is down the street from their house. The workers need to know, and the communities need to know. This is a mentality. We need to develop and ensure that we have this open mentality.

We have been working very hard over the last year or two on this responsible care program. One aspect was that we asked all of our companies to do a safety assessment, to look at themselves in terms of a broad emergency of a Bhopal-type to determine if we really know what can and cannot happen; if it does happen, if we know what to do; and if the community knows what it will do if that happens. We did those evaluations, and we found we were deficient in a number of areas. We have been working at it, we are going to do another survey in the spring to find out whether or not there has been any progress, and we will release the results of the survey.

The other part of it is, we are now in the process of developing a series of codes of practice. We do not say we will do away with regulations. No, that is naive and does not take account of the many changes occurring. On the other hand we do believe, if we talk about a commitment, it must be reflected not only in the reaction to the regulations which come up and in fighting them, it must be shown in our own ideas on how best we can implement the safe handling of chemicals in our companies.

In those codes of practice, are going to range from cradle to grave. We will be looking at how we develop products, how we manufacture them, how we transport them, how we distribute them and use them industrially, and eventually how we dispose of them. This is the kind of commitment we are developing within our industry. Now people could say, "Codes of practice, that is just your idea"; nevertheless, it is going to be a standard of judgment. They are going to be public, and people will be able to and should ask us questions about how we are performing; and we are developing systems of measurements that are going to enable us to say, "This is the kind of progress we have made". It is not just going to involve our industry, it should involve other industries which are transporting our products and using our products.

All of those things are what we believe are true measures of responsible care. One particular aspect of the commitment to right-to-know about the health effects or dangers is well exemplified in our community awareness program (which is one of the codes). In this program we have asked the plant managers in our companies

Jean Belanger *continued*

to be the catalyst to open dialogue within the community, to make sure people around our areas know what is going on, the possible dangers, whether emergency procedures are going to be satisfactory and well-integrated between the companies and the community.

We have started the program in 33 communities, and we have a long way to go yet. We have about 110 communities which have plants within our industry, but we have 33 that have already started, some of them obviously much faster than others, but they are moving in that direction. I believe you will see this as a commitment which is not perfect, but hopefully, a major movement. I think the mentality is also reflected in the community right-to-know where the Board of Directors has now approved a statement with a number of principles. The first one is, the community is entitled to the same type of health and safety information as the employees. We have already stated our commitment in the WHMIS project to what we believe the employee should know.

The provision of information to the public should recognize the need to protect legitimate trade secrets, which is the same agreement which we have here. Accurate hazard information shall always be provided regardless of trade secrets. It is very clear. Citizens in and around CCPA plants and warehouses have a right to know the health and safety and environmental risks associated with the manufacture, distribution, and transportation of products. Communities along major transportation routes have a right of access to member companies' information on the risks associated with the products, the volume and ranges of goods transported, and the accompanying safeguards. Finally, member companies will communicate to emergency response agencies the nature, volume and location of materials on the premises. We are not fighting the community right-to-know; we believe in this kind of principle. If we can all agree on it, we can move and bring out a lot more information than is now out in the public.

Coming back to WHMIS, the same mentality of openness must prevail. WHMIS is a triad—there are three parts to it. It is a three-legged stool, and you know what happens when you have only two legs on a stool—it gets very precarious. The first leg is the label, which is very specific, in terms of a supplier label; there is an MSDS as a second leg, some parts specific, some parts performance; and then what is going to keep the stool up is the third leg which you are talking about which is worker education and training. Without that one, the whole thing is going to fall.

Whether the approach is specific, (the label), or whether it is performance, it does not and should not change the commitment to transmit information on risks in the workplace. Without that worker training, the third leg, the system will not work.

Jean Belanger *continued*

I would like to look particularly at the WHMIS program and what it said about the worker education program. I think it is very important to recognize that there were two major aspects which drove the way in which labour, government and industry attacked the area of the worker education program. One was the fact that every workplace is unique. There is a difference in every workplace, different potential hazards and aspects, and already established major education programs in some companies. We do not want to destroy what is good, what we want is to bring everything up in the best way possible. So let's not destroy, but let's create and add rather than putting up a completely new building by razing the first one. Let's put some additions on the house; let's not just destroy things.

The second part of it is the consideration that Cliff mentioned Cliff said all legislation now states very clearly there is an obligation on the employer to provide a safe working environment. That is clearly in legislation. If management has this obligation, then it must also have the responsibility. Clearly said, the worker education program which would cover all mandatory matters of WHMIS is the responsibility of the employer, and the employers cannot shirk this responsibility.

On the other hand, it clearly states afterwards, the Joint Health and Safety Committee would be consulted over the design and delivery of the worker education component. Without that part, it is not going to work. There has got to be that working together to see what truly are the needs, how these needs are understood, and if there is the proper communication between the two sides. So those are very important aspects which must be retained and which I hope you will be retaining in this discussion.

In closing, I would just like to say, we must never forget what we are talking about here is that prevailing openness mentality which must be developed and obviously associated to it is trust, and we have to be working that way. Right after the Bhopal incident, you can very well imagine, I had to face a number of questions in the press and the obvious one that came to everybody's mind was, "can it happen here?" The chilling reality is "yes" it can happen here. That is not the complete answer, because I had to state something I believe very firmly which is that in Canada, as long as there is the commitment of the three important parties of government, employees and management of companies, then we are going to significantly reduce that risk, and none of these three can abandon the battle. We must all care together, and I hope this is the kind of message you can carry into your workshop today.

Thank you very much.

Questions and Comments

Peter Griffin
Manitoba Workplace Safety and Health Division

I would like to thank Cliff for his bit of advertisement about our paid educational leave legislation; it has worked quite successfully. Cliff mentioned that, in virtually every jurisdiction, education and training, appropriate to the workplace, are required by legislation; but he also mentioned he is quite proud of the fact that educational programming is being included in collective agreements. Cliff, why do you feel it necessary to put that sort of thing in a collective agreement if it is already covered by law? Does this mean the law does not work well?

Cliff Pilkey

I think the collective bargaining agreements can spell out some of the rights of workers in this whole field. Independent of what the law says, let me give you an illustration. The law provides a number of things, including vacations under the Employment Standards Act, yet they are still included in the collective bargaining agreements. The whole question of the law says, you have to go through arbitration, you can't just close the operation down. There is an agreement procedure which ultimately ends up in arbitration. Well the law says it, but we still have a section in the collective bargaining agreement that talks about arbitration and the process. We also should add that as part of the collective bargaining process as well as the law and more important is that the collective bargaining agreement can enhance what the law says. That is what we have done historically as well. The law is one thing, the collective bargaining agreement enhances it, and the law in Ontario is not particularly meeting the requirements of workers yet in this province. We have not reached that ultimate goal and, therefore, we are going to have to do some work on the collective bargaining agreement. It is a dual role.

Frank Gallant
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers

My question is directed to Jean Bélanger. In regards to your association's programs which you have implemented, I wonder if the information is available on the community awareness program and the 33 communities involved in this program. Which communities and which companies are involved? I would also like information on the Code of Practice Program, as far as the information which is available on the ongoing development of the program.

Jean Belanger

With regard to the codes themselves, they are available as they are being developed. The community awareness and emergency response code has been approved and, therefore, is now being prepared. It is being prepared in a form which will be given broad dissemination, but the code is ready at this time. I would estimate that within a month, we will have it in a form that we can distribute. What we want to do is not to just talk about the code itself, but how we are trying to do it, the kinds of support training, support that we are giving to this kind of approach, and some of the measurements by which we are going to be judged.

With regard to the communities, I think it is important that we recognize that the community awareness program is a six-stage process. The first stage is a rather innocuous one which is: each company names at each plant, a community coordinator who will be responsible for this task. First stage—the sensitization type phase. The third phase is, a first meeting of the various companies with the communities in which they are working. The sixth phase is the ultimate phase, where the community awareness and emergency response system will have been tested (in a broad test — specific test) with the community and with the public knowledge. Those are the various stages.

When I talk about the various communities, most of them at this stage are in levels 2 and 3. They are trying to decide how they are working. For example, there was a very good meeting about three weeks ago with Etobicoke which was like the starting of phase 3. Parts of the problem are in very big municipalities like Toronto which has several communities which are independent yet many of the emergency preparedness aspects are all linked to each other. These are in various stages. We will be reporting the names of those companies as they progress. We are looking at giving public recognition of the communities and the companies who have worked there. I know as an example, in Hamilton, there is already a committee that is working amongst the companies looking at how they are going to be doing this. I would say they are about close to stage three. That is all I can say. I do not have individual names at this time, but eventually we will be publishing each community and where it is at.

Frank Gallant

Is a list available of the companies which are members of your association?

Jean Belanger

Yes. We will distribute the list, including our Board of Directors and all the companies that are members, with the proceedings of this workshop.

I should have mentioned one other element in the right-to-know legislation. We have given some publicity to a 1-800 number which we are going to be setting up which will be a chemical referral centre; if anybody in Canada has a concern and would like information, we will ensure a company contact is specifically defined to answer the question. That could apply to a transporter, a worker, a consumer, a housewife who says, "I have this kind of product in my back shed, and I do not quite know if it is dangerous; do I need to worry about how to get rid of it; do I just throw it in the garbage?" We will assign a person who will answer the questions. We will not answer them at the Centre, but we are going to answer them by referring them to an authority in each of the companies. We are going to open it up so that non-member companies can also put their data there so we can have the information out; so again it is part of right-to-know belief which we are trying to underpin.

Brian Kohler
Energy and Chemical Workers' Union

My question is directed to Jean. In light of the remark you just made, if all the chemical producers in Canada would participate in the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, do you think this 1-800 number would be necessary? Are you not in effect duplicating a service of the Canadian Centre and by participating in the Canadian Centre, that information would be subject to independent quality control.

Jean Belanger

I think there are a number of aspects about this. Firstly, if our companies are going to meet their obligations to provide proper information, they want to be assured *they* will provide it. They need to know if there are concerns, they need to know if there are things that are occurring which perhaps they had not realized the depth of and, therefore, they will hopefully, at certain times, make changes in their procedures. They need to have direct access to that.

The second aspect is, it is a referral centre, and we continue to believe companies must respond to these things. If a company wishes to have the Centre listed as the place where the information will be provided, that wish will be put into the system and will be oriented towards the Centre.

Jean Belanger *continued*

I think you have to look at the variety of questions which are going to be asked. If it is a question about a specific product, an MSDS, in some ways hopefully as a first step, the information with the WHMIS system and legislation will be in the hands of the people; if it is not, there is going to be a legislative regulatory framework that says they should have it—you can ask for that.

The second part is, the commitment that CCOHS has given because we, as CCPA, have recommended to our companies to supply MSDS sheets to the Centre. I think a great proportion of the MSDS have come from our member companies at our recommendation. The joint commitment was that those MSDS sheets would not be changed. There may be questions at obvious times about what is on there and there could be a discussion, but the MSDS that is on the system is the MSDS that was provided by the company, because, as Cliff said, it is our obligation under law.

There will be other kinds of questions, and we will have to see who are the sources. If for example the media phones and says there has been an accident somewhere, and we are told that there is styrene in there; what are the dangers of styrene? We will give them, in all probability, a company that can provide them with information. Obviously, if it is a company's product that is at stake, it should have the chance to state what the problems of the product are, but we will probably also be saying that there are other sources of information and one of these could very well be the Canadian Centre, so it depends on the type of question asked. I know that I have probably not met your expectations on this but at the same time, I do believe that if we are going to be meeting our obligations, we are going to have to be very forthright and if people do not give out the information or if people give out the wrong information, they are going to be in trouble and they are not going to be supported by their peers.

Moe Kuzyk
Canadian Auto Workers Union

I would like to direct a general statement to the panel, and if I could draw an analogy with the people that we have present here, I would draw an analogy to a parent-teacher night; the parents attending usually represent the children that do well in school. It is unfortunate that the parents that do not attend are the parents of the children who do not do well in school. I think that at a meeting like this, where we are looking at setting some situations, setting some standards in regards to questions of training, we have representatives of industry and representatives of unions who are doing well in that field.

Moe Kuzyk *continued*

The topic I want to deal with specifically is the tripartite example that Jean dealt with and the fact of responsibilities. I had the pleasure of touring a small plant yesterday. If we look at a tripartite system, we first must look at management. In this company that I toured yesterday, they hire such a cross-section of non-English speaking people that there is difficulty for these people to communicate and discuss problems.

If I looked at the government responsibilities of a tripartite model as I toured the industry, I noticed several infractions of the Occupational Health and Safety Act which were quite evident to me, and it must have been just as blatantly evident to the government inspectors.

Thirdly, I looked at the workers with whom I had the opportunity to meet at break time to discuss some of their problems; as soon as their break finished, the plant manager came into the cafeteria and made sure that everybody returned to work and did not have any more time to meet with me. When I see this type of tripartite example in the workplace, I hope that somehow, through today and tomorrow's session, we will be able to work through that and maybe take some better information back into our workplace.

Lillian Vine

I can't think of better words on which to end. Yes, it is hard to reach the parent who is not interested; it is always hard to reach the unreachable. By reaching you, the interested and committed, by publishing the conclusions of your deliberations, we hope that many more will become reachable and committed to training for safer and healthier workplaces. We can thank Cliff Pilkey and Jean Bélanger for providing a very stimulating beginning to what we wish you to to be fruitful deliberations.

Workshop #1:
Content of an Education and Training Program

Task: Define what labour and management would expect the quantity of information to be in a chemical information training program.

Group 1 Rapporteur

Jan Logan
Director, Occupational Hygiene and Safety for Northern Telecom Canada

Basically, what we looked at was what was essential in a training program and what would be nice to know. We then looked at it in a slightly different way by saying "What general topics should be covered in the training and what specific topics should be covered?"

The first thing we did was define workers as all workplace parties, management or not; all workers in the workplace deserve and need some kind of training. This applied to all workplaces, small and large. The only distinction should depend on the hazards in the workplace, not on its size.

Essential information – We started with an overview of WHMIS. What is this new effort we are all a part of that is sweeping the country? We agreed that all workers should have an idea of what that was about, how to use the MSDSs and the labels that are prescribed by WHMIS, what they contain and how to use them as tools. We felt that everybody needs to have an overview of chemical hazards, including such things as routes of entry, concept of toxicity, health effects, how to identify hazards in the workplace, and what to do about them once they have been identified.

Job Specific Information – We then got into job specific hazards and the control measures in place to minimize or eliminate those hazards. Basically, this would include the procedures that you would use under normal conditions and what you would do in an emergency, including such things as first aid. Also, if you had a special role to play, perhaps as member of the Health and Safety Committee or as Supervisor or Manager or served in any other specific role, as part of an emergency response team, for instance, then you should be well trained in your particular role responsibilities. We felt these were the essential pieces of information in a training program.

"Nice to Know" – Under the "nice-to-know" category, we felt that we should all know the information that is being generated about hazards and chemicals. There should be a way that some of that information appropriately gets to the community and information from the community to the plant. For instance, if there were other plants in your neighbourhood, they might generate hazards and it would be nice to have a general idea of what they are and what is being done to control them. The "nice-to-know" category should include an understanding of industrial hygiene monitoring and training to do some very basic monitoring. This is a way of people taking responsibility, of understanding the problem to their own health, of reassuring themselves that everything is in good shape and of understanding the language of

Jan Logan *continued*

industrial hygiene. When there is talk about TLV, TWA, PPM and various other concentration measurements, all should have some idea of what it is all about. An understanding is also needed of why it is important to keep medical records.

Epidemiology – We talked a little about why it would be important to be able to do some epidemiology in the future as a way of evaluating whether the whole effort of WHMIS has been a good idea or not.

General and Specific Key Topics to be Included – We defined "workplace specific". We lumped that with other specific key topics, and here are some that we felt should be covered: obviously the workplace must have a chemical inventory (as a place to start) of what chemicals, where they are and in what quantities. There should be a mechanism for updating and that should be included in training so that people know and understand how it is being done. We need to know (1) what the raw materials are, (2) what by-products are produced because of the production process, and (3) any new products that might be generated by that process.

We felt it was important to understand any synergistic effects between two or more types of chemicals, and to understand the production process and systems such as ventilation systems that are part of the control of chemical hazards. It is also important to know what preventive maintenance systems are in place to ensure that the control systems continue to work in the manner in which they were designed to work.

There must be work procedures in place to govern the control and the minimization of hazards and where and when medical and industrial hygiene monitoring take place. People should be able to understand what is going on, what is going to be done, and why. This was not really intended to be an exhaustive list.

We divided all these into two topic areas, "core" and "generic". The really basic core was: what is WHMIS all about, what is an MSDS, and how do you use it, and what is a label and how do you use it — related to WHMIS. That is basic stuff that had to be done; it is generic and applicable to all workplaces. Other generic topics that apply across the country are routes of entry, health effects, concept of toxicity, hazard identification, and reporting and communication. These are the ideas that came from workshop #1, and I am happy to have been able to report on them. We had a good group, and I think that we generated a lot of good ideas.

Group 2 Rapporteur

Alena Zelinka
Researcher, Ontario Workers' Occupational Safety and Health Centre

We looked at the question in Workshop #1 rather generally as what was needed to be known. We decided that both general background and specific workplace related information must be available. The information must be accurate. It may be audited by an independent agency. It must be complete and current, perhaps as achieved by scheduled sessions. It may be beneficial to set up a data bank for this information.

Overall, the worker must have available a sufficient amount of information to be able to estimate the extent of any risk. S/he will be able to do this only if s/he receives not only the actual information, but also learns to interpret it. Workers must be taught to ask the right questions. We also agreed that care must be taken not to overload the recipients. Nevertheless, we had agreed that both labelling of materials as well as MSDSs must be discussed in detail in the training sessions.

Different information is required by different target groups. These may be new workers or workers who have been employed in the same capacity, workers who have received new and different responsibilities, or supervisors. Only they know what they need, and they must be consulted and targetted for a training program. Learning objectives must be established and feedback requested.

In addition, training programs must take into account different comprehension levels of the people to be trained. They must be able to deal with academic achievers as well as those who may not have the necessary background. Language problems must be addressed. An interesting viewpoint that was brought up was that of the native language problems; some of the technical terms are just not available in native language. Programs must be tailored to the various comprehension levels and every effort must be made to reach everyone. The training programs will then be acceptable to everyone.

It was also mentioned that, for greater impact, classroom sessions should be supplemented by job site demonstrations, illustrations, and such.

Workplace Specific Information – We touched very slightly on the workplace specific information. We agreed that MSDS were necessary. These must be standardized. We agreed that labelling of containers must be addressed and process information must be addressed.

General topics to be included – We decided that different groups require different degrees of detail and that the groups and the needs

Alena Zelinka *continued*

must be identified. The list of specific key topics we discussed, but not to the exclusion of others, included synergistic effects of agents, chronic effects, how to acquire information specifically, instructions in use of personal protective equipment (an example was mentioned of a case where respirators were used improperly in a way that was hazardous). Meaning of symbols must be addressed, how to interpret information and how to deal with information that is incomplete. A number of chemicals just don't carry the information that workers need or that we would like to provide for them. These are applicable to small and large workplaces; however, we realized that there will be more of a problem in smaller workplaces. This leads to the sharing of training information which we addressed further in workshop #3.

Group 3 Rapporteur

John Henry
Science Supervisor, Hamilton Board of Education

The difficulty with our group or the advantages of our group was that everyone was very strongly interested in safety so we had very few disagreements.

We felt that no one should censor information. There should be one place in the workplace where all the information could be found.

Therefore, there was no "nice to know", everything was "needed to know". We agreed that everything on the MSDS form was to be known, all the codes which are going to be used, a total inventory of all chemicals in the workplace, understanding what things mean, an explanation of what might happen to the body. In other words, if you are smoking, what will happen to you with the chemicals you are exposed to. As well, there should be information in the workplace on effects on the community. There should be information on transportation—how the chemicals should be transported.

Workplace-specific information means understanding that a worker has to be able to look at things quickly, and a decision must be made on chemicals used at a particular site. Suggestions were: a list of chemicals that the worker was exposed to over the years should be kept. There should also be work practices, emergency information at the work site.

"Do they apply to small and large workplaces?", the answer was a very simple, "Yes".

Group 4 Rapporteur

John Morrell
Co-Ordinator, Safety, Health and Security, Carleton Board of Education

WHMIS – If my group is any indication, WHMIS is not sweeping the country.

As a group, we were inclined toward agreement. We talked about the "Kiss" principle, and agreed that any program should contain layman's language. We made these decisions before deciding who our audience was and even before we had conducted a needs assessment.

We decided that any hazard communication program, in whole or in part, must answer the five "W's"—What, Where, When, Why, Who—and perhaps more importantly that the objective was to gain commitment. Exacting that commitment is not an easy task but is certainly a key factor in the success of the program, especially in obtaining participation at every level.

First, we thought that any hazard communication information training program should be generic. It should contain the pertinent details of its foundation in legislation, not so much for impetus, but rather for context and perspective. It should spell out the responsibilities of all the parties more clearly than they are now, emphasizing not only the legal requirements of each, but also the expectations at each level. It needs to outline how the information should be used at each level, that the MSDS is an important tool in the specific information requirements, some explanation of the terminology and where to look for the pieces of information often missing in the MSDS.

The chemicals should be grouped in general categories so that the safe handling procedures can be more easily grouped and more easily obtained by the people who have to handle them. The long and short-term health effects should be understood. No information system can achieve any credibility without the inclusion of standard work practices and controls and we thought that, as a minimum, storage, handling, use, and personal protective measures were the least that we should expect.

Strangely enough, one fact achieved consensus by its omission. No one said anything about proprietary rights. The whole information program begins with labelling. We already have lots of labelling for containers and goods that are transported. We have labelling that is required by manufacturers now and that is an important aspect already in place that could be improved.

Group 5 Rapporteur

Chris Marks
Health and Safety Department, Canadian Automobile Workers

Our group presented a model for tripartite discussion. The key word was ambivalence and the second key word, uncertainty. We had a lot of technical people and a lot of management people. I would say labour and government were under-represented. The reason I see for that is that we have not negotiated time into our contracts to attend workshops and conferences, and so on. But one of the members disagreed and said that his workers went to many more conferences than he did.

Our discussion level was very broad. We attacked the topics from every angle and generally ended up with a narrow conclusion and settled for the minimum standard on a lot of the things.

People think that engineering controls are designed in and basically are in place. Some were surprised to hear that all is not well in all workplaces; the emphasis often is to put the equipment on the worker and leave it on him and he will be okay. Given that industry has done its job and the controls are in place, there was a lot of tentative discussion about, "If things aren't working right, why aren't they? Why is the workplace unsafe? Why do we need to talk more about chemicals? What's gone wrong out there? The laws exist, aren't they being applied?" There was a lot of cross-country comparison. The expectation, in terms of content, is that industry will do its job in ongoing controls of the workplace, that major issues will be handled and that the worker will just need hazard training.

We agreed that there must be an understandable format; literacy was seen as an issue, as were second language and worker awareness.

There was discussion about whether workers need to know levels of exposure and whether they are capable of evaluating this kind of data. Most felt that this could be synthesized to symbols or ranges of hazards and that workers don't need to know what TLVs are. The case was raised of combinations or interactions of chemicals; a basic MSDS doesn't mention interaction between chemicals or changes in the workplace.This is an area that hasn't really been addressed in the chemical field, yet some think that probably the greatest hazards are synergistic effects and various chemical reactivities, decomposition and such. The group didn't think that they could extend basic content to include that but felt that somebody should be looking at it at some level.

There was emphasis on emergency procedures such as spill procedures and escape procedures. Long term effects of chemicals were mentioned.

Chris Marks *continued*

The right-to-know was an issue; we felt that it had been in place for a long time, but it is ill defined; that industry doesn't have much guidance in this area. There needs to be more discussion about it and some would like an elaboration or clarification of the issue to know who is covered and how.

WHMIS - WHMIS was a nice crutch for us. We felt that somebody is going to push WHMIS on us and we are going to do it—just tell us what to do and we will do it and this will make things a lot easier. In the group discussion it came out that WHMIS is basic and that it could be expanded in many directions. Somebody raised the problem of jurisdiction. It was difficult to look only at content because all the variables kept popping in, and the discussion became more and more complex.

Small Business and Unorganized Workers - We had consensus on the issue of small versus large. We felt that very small or unorganized plants should benefit from the full range of training that larger plants are able to afford and there should be no difference in these programs. In terms of application of this kind of content, it was again a big question mark. Everybody felt overwhelmed—how can we get this material to the small plants? There was agreement that materials should be subsidized. In the first discussion on content, "why" kept coming up, issues of financial burden and the need to do training, the role of government, the role of CCOHS, the role of union organizations. We did a lot of sharing on types and content of programs we have been doing. The issue of certification was a major issue with no consensus; we were not comfortable deciding who is qualified to do this kind of training.

Workshop #2
Delivery of an Education and Training Program

Task: Define what labour and management would find acceptable delivery in terms of quality.

Group 3

John Henry

We assumed that there was already a reason for a program so we did not go into doing an assessment. Labour and management had to develop the objectives which had to be clear and stated so that whoever they applied to would understand them.

The trainers (and we use trainers here not in terms of the word teacher) have to be good and they have to have knowledge and *they* have to be taught. The needs of the people you are going to educate have to be known, whether it's top management or workers on the floor. There was agreement that top management needed as much ongoing training as the worker on the shop floor. Evaluation had to be ongoing, it couldn't just be at the end; you had to evaluate what you were doing and you had to be flexible enough to change it if it was not perceived as doing the job according to the objectives. The workers would have to be able to understand. This, we knew, would open up some real difficulties, in language and ability to read. You have to, not talk down, but decide how to put your message over, whether it is through cartoons or through a 250 page academic memorandum. You have to have training aids, make training interesting, work on putting the topics over.

The people in our group were really interested in safety and one of the things forgotten was the cost factor. There has to be commitment from both sides. You have to keep things up-to-date and it has to be mandatory for every worker (here we use the definition from the Ontario Ministry of Labour). There has to be training, it has to be flexible, unbiased, non-political, you have to have plenty of resource material suitable to the workers.

Governments' Role - The question, "Do governments have a role in delivery of training programs?" The answer was no. The training program should meet the legal requirements, and to be effective, labour and management have to be working together. If an outsider comes in and does the programs, labour and management no longer own the program. We discussed responsibility of employer, worker, and joint responsibility in training, and the answer was "Yes".

Flexibility and Commitment Issues - Overall, there was complete agreement and very little discussion that the only way you are going to have delivery of an education training program is if labour and management work together. What we wanted to know was how to do this, not to state these common goals.

Group 4

John Morrell

We thought that one of the first factors in a good program was a statement of objectives and that it should be not only clear but supportive because it would become the prime motivator.

The statement should disseminate relevant, complete and correct information; that information should also be understandable; we will get into some of the factors involved in that in a moment.

We thought that the statement should help us to choose the mode and the intensity and the context we could design to suit our audience. There is no point in seeking acceptance for a program that does not receive the support of the whole organization — for example, sending people down to a workshop like this and then ignoring what they say when they get back home.

We thought that the program should be flexible. It needs to address ethnic and literacy problems. We had people in our group who are confronted with that particular problem almost on a daily basis. It also needed to be flexible to fit certain time and sequencing events both in terms of production and in terms of time available to the worker. It should be tailored to the user's activity level; you don't have to tell everything about the workplace to the people who are running the photocopiers was one example given.

We also thought that it should be performance oriented with built in checks or feedback mechanisms. There should be some way of testing the performance achievement all along the way by the person receiving the instruction; it could be done a number of ways including a test; even some form of a competency test at the end might be beneficial. There should be some means of being able to follow it up, both to revise it and to update the information.

Recognition/Certification of Training Programs - We also thought that recognition was very important in the program; but not necessarily certification. Certification implies that somebody is a little more expert and we didn't think that that was entirely necessary, but it may become part of the program for some. We also agreed that the quality of the program hinged on the presenters. If they are unable to create the awareness that the program deserves, there is little likelihood that the program will succeed.

Delivery - We agreed that delivery should be a joint responsibility but that the employer should be the sole facilitator for that program. As for the role of governments—we thought that they might want to pursue it as a consultant with some well-timed regulation but we agreed that the internal responsibility system should be maintained.

Group 5

Chris Marks

In the area of delivery, we drew a significant distinction between education and training. The group's emphasis seemed to be towards training. Education was considered more technical and more costly and we felt that what we really need right now is training to cover the basics. There was some argument about the efficacy of training if worker awareness and motivation are not addressed. Another program on personal protective equipment might not hit the levels that we are trying to hit with this chemical information.

Most of the people in the group were interested in the status of current legislation; they feel they really don't have much exposure to it and they'd like more information. There was an awareness that changes are coming and that industry has to do more than it has been doing.

There was a lot of uncertainty about responsibility. The group felt if business has all the responsibility, why discuss it--if this is true and the job is being done. In our second workshop, WHMIS was seen as a first step; it is not totally acceptable, but it is a starting point.

There was some discussion of Bill 101 and the interface of various legislations. From this discussion came the idea of long term training. There is a need, we are entering into this new field and we are going to have to make this a regular program, whether monthly, annually or whatever. The group agreed that it wanted to start small and that testing was a big issue. When you are in business, accountability and the balance sheet are an issue; if you are going to pay for a program, you want to know that the worker is clearly getting training, so you want testing. It was pointed out that in adult education, testing can be a stumbling block to learning; it is difficult to test all of the range of skills needed in terms of working with chemicals. There was no great enthusiasm to develop standards or certifications. With this much uncertainty, it would seem that a standard would be welcome because industry and the tripartite system need to pull together to make a clear focus for training and education.

Responsibility in Training - Employer responsibility was a major issue. Again, it was felt that generic information should be delivered by the employer. This is supposedly material already publicly accessible; nobody would be losing anything by distributing it across the country. Competitive edge was a major stumbling block. Here we had the argument of trade secrets and proprietary rights.

The question was asked whether industry would be able to, in groups, discuss what standards it wanted for certain types of programs but it was generally felt that no industry would fund this approach. An obstacle in terms of sharing programs and delivering

Chris Marks *continued*

them was liability. Companies worried that if they offered their program for use by others and if somebody were hurt or made ill, they could be held liable. It was also mentioned that antitrust suits are causing business to be more reticent about sharing information; a lot of businesses aren't even joining their own associations because of antitrust suits, so it would virtually be impossible to share secret or semi-secret chemical information.

We looked for a model of an enforceable standard. We said if we are talking about enforcing WHMIS or enforcing chemical education, is there a model that we have already that is working. Transportation of Dangerous Goods (TDG) was mentioned. We agreed that it is a clearly laid out standard, but we also had examples that it is not enforced across the board.

We also talked about the application of the Occupational Health and Safety Act and similar pieces of legislation. So again, there was uncertainty; people felt they wanted to do something, but between government, labour and management, we were not sure if we could get our act together and go forward strongly. Delivery was decided to be basically for core material. There was some general unwilling consensus that this would be a tripartite presentation; it was brought up that a lot of the training happening now is being delivered involuntarily under government orders; once that happens, it is costly, awkward, an embarrassment and it was generally agreed that it is better to put a voluntary program in place before you are forced to do.

Group 1 Rapporteur

Helen Barr
Occupational Health Coordinator for Ontario, Shell Canada

We had a dynamic group—actively participative people, good broad representation. We agree with a lot of what has been said.

Delivery of an Education Program – We went through the four part system of any program – access, plan or develop, implement and evaluate. We felt that was very important in anything that you put into a workplace.

We felt the inventory at the work site was very important—hazardous materials, MSDS sheets obtained at the site, the risk assessment to include the controls in place.

Define your audience—do they have previous training, the who, what, why, when, where, so that you know exactly who you are speaking to. You have to take into account cultural differences,

Helen Barr *continued*

language differences, illiteracy, ethnicity, so that your audience understands what you are talking about.

How many workers? How do you get the information to the people who need it? We believe that you have to have certification in terms of the program being certified. You have to train your trainers and train your workers.

Responsibility for Training - In the assessment, we felt there should be a jointly developed chemical information program for all workers conveying relevant information to those workers. In some instances, in even one company like our own—we would take a package, perhaps a generic package and massage it for our different locations, different types of work, such as chemical plants, refineries, distribution centres, packaging, and even office buildings.

In the planning area, we felt everybody should be involved—IAPA, CAW, OFL. There should be core and generic materials. Specific issues from the workplace should be added, and possibly a pilot program for the health and safety committee. This training should be participative and adaptive to the workplace; trained instructors should deliver training to workers.

Design and Delivery - In the area of implementation, delivery should be a joint program. Joint design and delivery would result in improved acceptance of the program; everybody who takes part in it then has ownership of it.

Evaluation - question one, "how do you define standards of quality in a program?" We felt that the bottom line was that training should make a difference in the workplace. Success is really judged by the workplace parties. This would include such things as questionnaires, evaluation; people should be asked exactly what they got out of it and what further information they need. There should be on the job follow-up to ensure that the practices are being followed.

Recognition/Certification in Training Programs - If certification is about giving a test or an examination to people of different languages and literacy, we felt this probably was not the way to go. One of our members commented that in his workplace, there were people with grade 8 education and giving them a multiple choice test or an exam was no way of assessing that they understood exactly what had been taught; this is possibly a place for a practical or oral questionnaire, "do you understand this?" Certification doesn't necessarily have to be a certificate or a piece of paper, but just ensuring that the people have the information and that they understand it.

Helen Barr *continued*

Role of Governments – With regards to "do governments have a role in delivery of training programs?". We felt that maybe there should be a role and this possibly might be in an audit setting. We felt that there would be a cultural separation if the government administered these programs off-site; that they were probably far better administered right in the work site setting. It is a way of setting our own quality standards and of ensuring that these programs, in fact, do occur. The government could act as auditors or governing body, to check that these programs are being given. The problem that people saw with this is that it is fine for those of us in big companies that have industrial hygienists, toxicologists, and people to give this training, but we were concerned about the little ABC welding company that had two or three employees—who was going to give the program for them? In some cases, it might be a government agency that would have to supply this training, possibly in the role of enforcement or delivery.

Flexibility issues – were not discussed thoroughly. We felt that flexibility meant the program being flexible either to each work site or to each work location even within a large company and I think the commitment was expected to be a joint commitment by all parties involved.

Group 2 Rapporteur

Chris Goulard
Assistant Director of Engineering, Rockyview Hospital, Calgary

It was in Workshop #2 that we finally really got focussed. It was the quality of the delivery of the training program. The standards of the quality were determined: it had to be acceptable to labour and management, it had to be relevant to all the parties. A questionnaire, self evaluation was mentioned by our group. The quality would be rated by performance, be results oriented.

Inspection – We felt inspection was required and in that way, you would ensure you were continuing to meet the needs of the parties. The inspection would also determine whether or not the training materials were adequate, and if the delivery was successful. You can make a program, but you must ensure the delivery is successful.

Evaluation – It was mentioned that evaluation could look at the rate of improvement or the rate of change at a workplace rather than at a static situation. The program must be mutually acceptable; flexible, measurable and (mentioned several times) it must have competent instructors to ensure quality.

Chris Goulard *continued*

Statistics should be used to measure the results-oriented programs, but the caution was that statistics can be altered by many variables and, in fact, it was mentioned that from gatherings such as this we will alter statistics when we go back into the workplace and start implementing our programs. The governments may find out there are more incidents reported just because of a gathering like this.

Recognition/Certification - On the recognition/certification question, we actually ended up determining two different questions, and saying certification was certification of instructors, and there is definitely a need to certify instructors. The certification of the trainers will ensure a level of competence.

Recognition we determined to mean issuing diplomas or certificates after the completion of a program by the participants. We felt this was a tangible recognition of their efforts and could act as a positive reinforcement—it may be an incentive for the participants to learn.

It was mentioned by one of our group members, and there was no dissension, that diplomas should be issued only for courses exceeding one day, since too-easily-obtainable diplomas are not appreciated. The one dissenting opinion we would like to report was that issuance of diplomas may create false assumptions about the knowledge of the participant. The point was that education is an ongoing process; it does not stop when you get the diploma.

Responsibility - It was fairly well determined that training as a joint responsibility was the only way for it to be successful. All the parties have the responsibility of doing a needs assessment to determine what training is necessary. All of the parties have to assess the depth of training required. We agreed you had to target the groups you were going to be addressing (much the same as Group #1) and the five W's. There has to be joint preparation of the program—the development of the program has to be joint, and the delivery of the program has to be joint. This is the responsibility of all of the parties, who then have the follow-up responsibility of evaluating the program effectiveness. We concluded that the joint responsibility is the responsibility of all the parties to have respect for each other, to cooperate with each other, and to develop a spirit of trust, if the program is to be successful.

The employer responsibility, we determined, was to provide the resources to allow the training—the cost, money, equipment, and time. As well, it was mentioned that the employer, particularly small employers with limited resources, should be able to obtain government assistance.

Chris Goulard *continued*

The employee responsibility in the training is a hard thing to talk about because you have to have some cooperation from the employee, but it came down to three things: the employee has to be committed to the training program, study diligently when in a program, and participate in the feedback so the program can be evaluated.

Government role – We determined government should not deliver the training programs; this is not its function. However, we found it may be essential to get government assistance for small industries with limited resources; we limited it to providing instructors and training aids. We determined the government should provide an advisory and exchange role, should set the minimum requirements and act as an enforcer; this is particularly important with unorganized shops. Government should act as an arbitrator in the event of conflict, and could act as a facilitator and coordinator for the training programs.

We had dissenting opinions on whether or not it is the government's, manufacturer's or employer's responsibility to approve all training programs. The people who felt the government should approve all training programs thought it would lead to some standard. The people who were against it said it was the manufacturer's responsibility as the government does not sufficiently understand every different industry to be able to approve the training program.

The other dissenting opinion involved WCB involvement in training. We decided we could not agree on it because WCB has a credibility problem with its record. It was hard to say that it could be involved in education, when apparently Ontario people were saying they were heavily involved in claims reduction.

Commitment and flexibility issues – we really covered that by saying we had to have feedback, and it was a joint responsibility to make sure the needs were met. With commitment, we agreed management should agree to training during working hours, should address all Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee recommendations, and should provide the resources, in particular the time.

Labour's commitment is to provide the instructor for joint training; to provide feedback for evaluation; to provide cooperation and some measure of flexibility to allow the training process to happen—such as the rescheduling of shifts, if we are all going to be committed to it. The other thing labour should be committed to is home study, if it is required.

Chris Goulard *continued*

The joint commitment is a spirit of cooperation: we all have to have it otherwise it will not work: we have to have a joint commitment to review the training program to keep it current.

Workshop #3:
Access and Retrieval

Task: Define how labour and management expect to assemble and provide training materials in the workplace.

Group 5

Chris Marks

I think what we are looking for in our program is common ground. We talked about this and sharing (joint action).

Access and Retrieval - Our group found the potential here was limited. We all felt a need for standardization, but did not have too much motivation or I should say not too much hope, at this time, to standardize materials. The point was raised about computer availability, CD-ROM facilities, etc, and a lot of concern for small plants and how these people could access this information. Also, there was some question whether the union people would be prepared to interact with these sophisticated types of systems.

Generic Material - Basically, the group was not interested or not willing or not able to go beyond sharing generic material - that was our level of comfort. A model was presented by one of our group members for how training should be handled, and it started with federal guidelines and codes. I think that is because we know there are a lot of jurisdictions and overlaps and most of us felt we need one central way of going with this chemical information. Some felt the provinces should either do funding or have some type of application, while others felt business should be responsible; maybe we are looking at a joint effort in that area.

The third model was the Joint Health and Safety Committee. After a lot of discussion, most of us agreed that where the committee is in place in a lot of factories, it might be the body which addresses training or education.

Hours of Training - There was discussion about the number of hours of training and again models were talked about. The OFL program used to be 30 hours, and now it is being presented as a full week (40 hour) program in a lot of places. Sometimes companies want to fold their job specific material into an OFL program. A lot of companies are going for additional two-and-a-half-day hazard training on top of that. A lot of IAPA material is being folded in. The industry group felt comfortable with a 6 to 7 hour package; somehow they think WHMIS is it, and 6 to 7 hours is enough. General emphasis seemed to be on distributing information.

It was felt by some management representatives that workers do not want a learning experience. On the other hand, others in the group felt workers need a basic foundation in health and safety, a basic understanding of general risks related to chemicals. Basic awareness has to be generated to produce tangible results in actual performance.

Chris Marks *continued*

Definition of a Worker - Another issue which arises is who is a worker. A lot of you have mentioned this issue, and my group basically felt workers were hourly employees. They are passive receivers of information which management delivers. I think if we spent three more days, we might work a lot on that perception. Our group had good trust levels in discussion. There was a lot of revelation going on, but not too much modification of attitudes.

What I could see as part of the problem is that people in health and safety are very often not the high-powered people. They see all the problems and they have nothing to do with solving them. One of our members said when he went back, he would like to share the information upward, but he would not be given the chance, and sharing it downward was irrelevant. Hopefully the information we have exchanged here will not drop into a void.

Again, the emphasis was on safety rather than health mechanical problems. I think this reflects the old attitude of the worker as an extension of a machine.

Group 1 Rapporteur

Bob Bucher
Chairman, Occupational Health and Safety Education Authority of Ontario

Our group felt this was a very worthwhile, enjoyable and in some ways inspirational process to go through. There are some clear notions of things emerging, and there seems to be agreement. For me, it reinforces the fact that people, even if with some divergence in views and philosophy, can work together and find resolutions, when there is a very important and common cause. From my point of view, working in a tripartite organization, I am very encouraged. I commend those involved in putting this process together.

We, in all of the workshop sessions, inquired vigorously. The great statesman Otto Van Bismarck said, "inquiry you should approach with some caution "—he felt there were three things which you should not look into or inquire about too deeply.One of them was the institution of marriage — he felt you should just leave it, not try to explain it away. He thought it was dangerous to go too deeply into how government works, and he also felt it was dangerous to look too deeply into how sausage was made. But we did not stand by any of those cautionary suggestions from Van Bismarck, we got into things, and it was a useful process.

For the purposes of access and retrieval, defining how labour and management could expect to assemble and provide, we considered

Bob Bucher *continued*

training materials in three categories: core materials, generic materials, and workplace or job specific materials.

Core Materials – We considered core materials to be a WHMIS overview. We consider what took place through WHMIS as unprecedented in this country. It is extremely (not just in terms of substance, but in process) important and all the working people in this country should be aware of what was accomplished and what the objectives and requirements are of WHMIS. Therefore, for core materials, WHMIS overview, labels and of course, MSDSs which are in any event clearly set out.

Generic – Under the generic headline, we felt such things were routes of entry, health effects, matters relating to explanation of toxicity, and where they exist, characteristics of mutagenicity, carcinogenicity. We excluded legislation for national distribution because we felt there were some obvious problems in trying to recognize where the provinces are in terms of developing right-to-know legislation that will respond to WHMIS, and perhaps go beyond WHMIS. Other elements under generic were hazard identification, and basics about chemical hazard control.

To the three questions posed on the agenda we were given, I think under ideal circumstances, we would be wanting to say "yes" to every one of those. But we recognize there are some impediments, in particular in the area of workplace specific information in terms of "shareability". We were able to do some consensus squeezing — a term I had not heard before yesterday, but I can assure you it was not painful. I would be pleased to consensus squeeze with that group anytime.

The points on which we did have consensus were (1) information should be nationally available in the core and generic categories (2) it should be developed by a tripartite forum (3) materials should be provided without cost to the parties in the workplaces that need them.

On some ideas there was some agreement but not necessarily consensus such as a national agency perhaps the Canadian Centre, to collect and distribute materials—it might not now be possible, if for no reason other than financial consideration, but that ultimately it should be in a position to facilitate this collection and distribution process; or development by a private organization to meet some pre-determined specifications; we did not go into much detail on a scrutinizing review process by a tripartite body to ensure acceptability of what is developed.

Bob Bucher *continued*

Another point we did not pursue in any great detail was that no matter who develops core, and perhaps generic materials, there would be no requirements that these specific materials be used. So that even if a national agency is able to develop such materials, nothing will require people in the workplace to use those materials.

Group 2 Rapporteur

Bill Denault
Director, BC Construction Industry Health and Safety Council.

This issue incidentally was the only area where we had difficulty in coming to consensus on most items. The debate was very interesting and sincere, and I would like to discuss the areas of consensus first and then cover the areas we were not able to come to consensus on.

Should generic and workplace specific information be freely distributed throughout Canada? – We felt that common procedures and methods would be useful throughout Canada, with perhaps the message that this information would be intended to suit specific workplaces.

Substance control was mentioned. How are certain toxic and dangerous substances handled elsewhere in Canada? We felt it was essential to share this information rather than to develop this information on our own. Therefore, a central source repository was strongly suggested, particularly aimed at the Canadian Centre, for example, already being established along these lines.

Training material we felt should be shared and again through the Canadian Centre if possible, for distribution purposes. One method suggested was a common data bank. There was a consensus that a central repository could represent significant cost savings. Some of the conditions attached to these areas of consensus were—the material must be reliable, particularly in the areas of toxicology. Safety booklets we felt could be shared, but codes of practice may be too specific to some sites to be implemented elsewhere. In-house material could be cost effective, but there was a concern that small industries may not be able to afford the best material available, and that some common sharing could alleviate this concern.

One of the areas we were not able to come to a consensus on was sharing of proprietary information. Some felt it was user required, while some felt no way could be evolved. We were not able to overcome those two positions. There is an opposing viewpoint also that it should be the government's mandate to distribute this information.

Bill Denault *continued*

Important were certification of accuracy, dated and quality assured with a reinforcement through the MSDS. Private enterprise felt it was able to produce better information than recycling it through the Canadian Centre. It has the sole authority, has developed the material, and would feel (for various reasons, legal notwithstanding), that it would prefer to distribute it than have it passed through some scrutinizing mechanism that could adjust it. Based on those facts, we were unable to come to a consensus on that topic.

Group 3

John Henry

We started our last session at 25 seconds past 3:30 pm and to the question should generic and workplace specific information be freely distributed throughout Canada? we said "yes".

Should such materials be accommodated for national use, we said "yes".

Can all workplaces access training materials, we said "yes".

At 3:32 pm there was a motion that we had now finished our discussions and, therefore, we would finish the session, and we did. That was my consensus. There are a couple of points within the two minutes between 3:30 pm and 3:32 pm which we did bring up.

We felt the Canadian Centre was doing a marvelous job; all materials should be going through it. Someone said that if a manufacturer, when asked about obtaining data sheets for trade name chemicals would not give you the data sheets, you just said "no" to purchasing the product; it's amazing how quickly that or another manufacturer would come up with data sheets.

Group 4

John Morrell

I would like to begin my remarks by saying I am one of the believers in the management theory that there are many errors and little doubt; and our group leader, Clarence MacPherson, very ably ameliorated that view all the way to the other end of the spectrum which lent itself to complete control by some big brother organization. In any event, Clarence is deserving of a compliment; he led our group very well.

John Morrell *continued*

By the time we reached this workshop, most, if not all of the elements, had been under discussion. We thought present legislation was probably sufficient to handle almost everything we are presently faced with.

We have a lot of legislation out there which needs cultivating, and our group seemed to sense this. If it needed to be fertilized by some mechanism such as WHMIS, that was about the extent to which we wanted the government to become involved.

Generic Information – We agreed any program, regardless of its size or form, should be generic. We thought generic information should be freely accessible, and in some cases, distributed throughout Canada. If any specific information is necessary, we thought it should be developed at the worksite, and this could be made accessible through some sort of consultative process. It might be through a safety association (in place in most provinces and most jurisdictions in Canada) or some other representative group, or perhaps CCOHS. We thought CCOHS' role might be expanded or continued as a repository for some of the specific and generic information so it could be made available throughout Canada.

In the absence of some specific information, we thought it might be worthwhile for the safety associations or CCOHS to identify those areas and even to help out where the workplaces are small and might need some additional incentive to provide the safety factors in that particular workplace.

Questions, Comments and Concluding Remarks

Questions and Comments

Peter Griffin

John Henry did a very good description of the workings of Group #3. We had a lot of consensus in a lot of areas and we did address the issues in a very serious manner.

There were some shortfalls, I felt. My anticipation of the program was there would be expert safety and health people to tell us the right way of doing things, the tried and true way, the practical way, or the properly prioritized way. We would then break into workshops; discuss this, brainstorm; pick it apart and put it back together; add our own ideas. We would then get back together and have the experts in safety and health take what we had done, critique it and say, "you guys are on the right wave length, the wrong wave length, or no wave length". That was my expectation.

I fully recognize the value of the Centre and of the CCINFO system. I am a major user of the CCINFO system. I pull documents on a regular basis and use them in my work. I use it as a valuable resource.

This particular workshop was not up to my expectations — that is a personal opinion and I am glad to see that others' expectations were fulfilled.

Don Swiston
Oakville and District Labour Council:

The topic of our workshop is training. With respect to training, time is the most valuable commodity in the workplace. Money could be made available much more easily than authorization of time to release workers to be trained. One of the quotes in our particular workshop was "I could get $100,000 easier than shut down a paint shop for one day's training on isocyanate hazard" and I think this is not an isolated circumstance. I have similar constraints facing me every day and paradoxically I do not feel constrained by economics as much as I do by time. Now, when you look at training, training is time. If you do not have the time, you do not have the training. What is necessary is some sort of legislated enforcement that obligates the parties to afford the access to the training.

Dorothy Richardson

One of the biggest problems I have in terms of the information shared over the last day-and-a-half — and it shows my bias right now — is trying to figure out where government fits into all this.

Dorothy Richardson *continued*

I think I will narrow it in terms of just core training material, because I think if we expand beyond that, it will become unmanageable.

As I understand it, the idea that prevails is core material should be developed through some sort of tripartite process so that workers, management, and government or the inspectors who are going to be involved in some way, can collectively arrive at a reasonable core of material.

The issue then comes up as to the acceptability of that material. I have heard different suggestions as to how that acceptability is going to be determined. I have a sense that acceptability may be determined simply because a tripartite group put it together; or that it have some sort of quality assurance done through an independent group such as the CCOHS, which in itself is tripartite; or I have heard the suggestion that governments, essentially through their inspection authority, would determine the standard - one group, at least, did say something about the adequacy and success of the program being assessed through inspection. Obviously those three things are very different ways of assessing whether the core material is acceptable.

I would like to get a little more sense, if people are willing to share it with me, of how to deal with this problem. My reading right now, at least in terms of the people I have been dealing with at the federal and provincial levels, is that governments are probably not going to want to get any more involved in the training aspect than is absolutely necessary.

I think probably in terms of some financial assistance or the distribution of some material, they may be open to that suggestion, but I do not think they see themselves as doing the actual training.

Unidentified

In our group we talked about the core material being developed by a tripartite group; on the assumption that the tripartite group has some good health and safety experience, skills and education, we would expect it to come up with some good basic material.

Once it is out in the workplace, what is the definition of the acceptable? What is acceptable to one group could be different from what is acceptable to another. Someone talked about a quality-assurance group at a workplace which involved the joint management/non-management health and safety committee to test the acceptability of procedures in that workplace. It may be that

Unidentified *continued*

the joint health and safety committee, or even a more general employee involvement, is an avenue for testing acceptability in the workplace. Acceptability is what is acceptable in that particular workplace in the particular circumstances faced by the workers in that workplace.

Frank Gallant

Our involvement with the Centre over the past three years has been healthy, growing and it has been very rewarding. I would like to emphasize that the Canadian Centre is a valuable resource funded by our government, for anybody who wants to use it, and wants to participate through involvement.

In contradiction to the comment that was made about what participants expected when they came here, I am pleased with the facilitation, with the direction and with the information to discuss the issues. We are the people who know the facilities we work for and we are the people who know what is necessary in each one of our different environments. We are the experts and I think it is up to us, a good cross-section of Canadians and a good cross-section of management and labour, to put together a program from all our expertise, as individuals in management and in labour in this type of forum.

We should put the Centre on the point of information base only, get it to provide us with this type of leadership, not to tell us this is the way to do it, and this is the way it is going to be done. I think that is what *we* are here to do. On those bases alone, I thank the Centre for the opportunity of being here, and I hope it will continue to extend information and this type of forum, to all of us and possibly four times as many people in the future.

Doug Hicks

I really appreciate the chance to interface with the unions and the different unions, as I am a management person. Our group ran excellently. My congratulations to John.

We are all here to do something for the worker; the worker is not the person who does the work on the floor, it is everybody from the top down. We have all learned something and we are going to take that back. If this workshop was going to do any more for my expectation, it might have been to have the expert up there,

Doug Hicks *continued*

who has already put something in it, so I could pick it apart and go back and see where I am wrong. I want to thank you.

Lillian Vine

Thank you all very much. I am going to turn the chair over to Gordon Atherley.

Concluding Remarks

Gordon Atherley

I will not attempt to summarize what we have heard because the reports from all of you – the participants, will appear in the proceedings. Those proceedings, will be worked on as fast as possible, we will check the text through the chairmen to make sure that it reflects what you were saying and we will produce them in both languages.

I would ask you perhaps to judge the process ultimately by that final product; the test will be, if you find yourself using the document, going to a committee, management, colleagues, professional association, saying we discussed this and there are some ideas here which may be helpful in taking the next step, then the workshop has been useful to you. That is one point of judgment.

The second is, if you found you got some sense of what other people are thinking and perhaps a sense of what your next step should be when you go back to your places of responsibility, then too will it have succeeded.

I hear and appreciate the comments. We listen and we will take all the comments seriously. On the one hand, perhaps we did not give enough information; on the other hand, many people do not want to be spoken to by experts; they really want the chance to talk things through with others who are struggling with the same problems.

The process may be a little different from the usual speech or presentation, with short discussion on the end of it. But you know there is that old comment about a camel being a horse designed by a committee. Well, it was obviously a committee that squeezed the consensus because it is a pretty strange creature. The camel has got huge nostrils, two lumps, and big flat feet — it looks just awful going down Main Street, Hamilton. I could imagine nothing more useless; but get it in the desert, where you have to go 20 days without water, and it is a very useful creature.

Gordon Atherley *continued*

What I would put to you is the idea of the process of tripartism. I was interested that so many of us are involved in tripartism. It is maybe a bit like the process that leads to the camel. It is different, its product is unusual, maybe ungainly, but it does a fine job for the purpose you really want it to serve.

I put it to you then that CCOHS is a resource for you, to the extent you want it. That is all we can be. We cannot be written into legislation that obliges anybody to use us. The agenda here was not for us to get a mandate to do something and indeed the Council of Governors, which Martin O'Connell chairs, has said very clearly that CCOHS' role is not to deliver training; but if we can help you, as an information resource, electronically or in other ways, we are just delighted.

So that leads me to my final statement. We specialize in collaboration which is a kind of squeezing of the consensus to a stage further where something happens, and we do it together. We would like to feel that out of this workshop has come some togetherness between us, because we want this process to evolve and if the idea of facilitated workshops spreads, we will be very pleased.

Thank you. You have done a great job, and I think when you come to look at these proceedings, you will feel a sense of ownership. I think you will find it useful, and I think you will find it helpful when you come to face these responsibilities.

Workshop Participants

Mr Gordon R Andrew
Safety Supervisor
Ontario Paper Company

Mr Gerry Askew
CAW Specialist - Health and Safety
Telecom Terminals Division
Northern Telecom Canada Limited

Ms Helen Barr
Occupational Health Coordinator - Ontario
Shell Canada Limited

Mr Dan Bartlett
Safety Supervisor
Fleet Industries

Mr Keith Bates
Worker Representative and Chairman
Joint Health and Safety Committee
Mohawk College

Mr Bill Bell
Plant Safety Supervisor
3M Canada

Mr David Bennett
National Representative
CLC Workplace Health and Safety

Louise Breadner
Manager, Health and Safety
Telecom Terminals Division
Northern Telecom Canada Limited

Mr Robert Bucher
Chairman
Occupational Health and Safety Education Authority

Mr Garry Bucholz
Occupational Environment Co-ordinator
Atlas Specialty Steels Division

Mr Ken Buikema
Safety Coordinator
Ontario Cancer Institute

Mr Joe Buller
Director, Human Resources
The Brantford General Hospital

Ms Neena Chawla
Training Development Consultant
Industrial Accident Prevention Association

Mr Michael P Coleman
Executive Committee Member
Ironworkers Local 721

Mr Wayne Collins
Technical Sevice
Helmitin Canada Inc.
ASMAC (Adhesive Sealants Manufacturers Association of Canada

Mr Al Collinson
Head, Safety Education Section
Safety Division
Government of Northwest Territories

Mr Craig Daws
Safety/Purchasing Coordinator
Union Carbide Agricultural Products (Canada) Ltd

Mr Bill Denault
Director
BC Construction Industry
Health and Safety Council

Mr Ray Dojcak
Safety Committee Representative
Local Lodge 863
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers

Ms Jo-Ann Douglas
Coordinator, Occupational Health and Safety
Laboratory Administration
Chedoke-McMaster Hospitals

Mr Chuck Emberson
United Steelworkers of America
Local 1005

Mr Frank Gallant
President, Local Lodge 863
International Association of Machinists
and Aerospace Workers

Mr Fred Gifford
Head, Occupational Health and Safety
Safety Division
Government of Northwest Territories

Mr Chris Goulard
Assistant Director of Engineering
Rockyview General Hospital

Mr Peter Griffin
Industrial Hygienist
Manitoba Workplace
Safety and Health Division

Miss Elizabeth Hannah
Occupational Health Nurse
Atlas Specialty Steels Division

Mr John Harrison
Technical Manager, Environmental Affairs
Lepage's Limited

Mr Bert Hart
Health and Safety Assistant
Ontario Public Service Employees Union

Mr Robert Hawthorn
Occupational Health and Safety Engineer
IAPA

Mr Arnold Hein
Warehouse Supervisor
Onex Packaging Incorporated

Mr John Henry
Science Supervisor
Hamilton Board of Education

Mr John F Herbin
Director of Training
Nova Scotia Department of Labour
Occupational Health and Safety Division

Mr Douglas K Hicks
Health and Safety Coordinator
CAE DieCast

Ms Agneta Hollander
Assistant Manager, Occupational Health
Canadian Pulp and Paper Association

Mr John D Keenan
Manager, Product Stewardship and Quality Assurance
Dow Chemical Canada Inc.

Mr Tom Kennedy
Health and Safety Representative
Independent Canadian Steelworkers Union

Mr Brad Kerr
Coordinator, Hazardous Substances Information Program
Health Care Occupational Health and Safety Association

Mr Julian Kloda
Health and Safety Representative
3M Canada

Mr Brian Kohler
Health and Safety Officer
Energy and Chemical Workers' Union
Local 800

Mr Ray Kosan
Occupational Hygienist
Ontario Hospital Association

Ms Myrna Krause
OH Nurse
Perley Hospital

Ms Jan Kron
Varian Canada
Health and Safety Administrator

Mr Moe Kuzyk
Health and Safety Department
CAW-Canada

Mr Paul Langford
Industrial Hygienist
Fiberglas Canada
Technical Centre

Mr Romeo LeBlanc
CAW Local 127

Mr Andrew Li
General Manager
DG Systems and Supplies

Ms Jan Logan
Director, Occupational Hygiene and Safety
Northern Telecom Canada Ltd

Ms Chris Marks
Health and Safety Department
CAW-Canada

Mr Hal Maskis
Development and Safety Manager
Budd Canada Inc

Mr Tom McCrae
Safety Supervisor
National Steel Car Limited

Mr Bill McPherson
Safety Supervisor, Hilton Works
Stelco Inc

Mr Clarence MacPherson
Executive Director
Ontario Workers' Occupational Safety and Health Centre

Ms Loretta Michaud
Communications Officer
Ontario Workers' Occupational Health and Safety Centre

Mr Bob Moggach
Manager, Manufacturing, Training and Development
3M Canada

Ms Anne Monteath
Manager, Occupational Health and Safety Department
The Hospital for Sick Children

John Morrell
Co-Ordinator, Safety, Health and Security
Carleton Board of Education

Mr Jack Noonan
Executive Director
Occupational Health and Safety Division
Department of Labour

Mr John Pelrine
Division III / Chairman
Local 1005
USWA - Health and Safety Committee
Stelco Inc

Ms Edith Pereira
Supervisor, Research and Development
Industrial Accident Prevention Association

Mr Steve Phinney
Fiberglas Canada

Dr Dorothy Richardson
Special Advisor - WHMIS
Labour Canada
WHMIS

Mr Ron Ripley
Executive Vice President
Public Service Alliance of Canada
Agriculture Union

Mr Norman Robar
Nova Scotia Federation of Labour

Mr Vic Robbins
Safety Committee Representative
Local Lodge 863
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers

Mr Gary Sachs
Safety Coordinator
Mohawk College

John Sanderson
Manager - Safety and Hygiene
Nova, An Alberta Corporation

Ms Yvonne Slupiniski
Planning Analyst, Strategic Policy Unit
Ministry of Labour

Ms Deborah L Smith
Senior Occupational Hygienist
Community and Occupational Health
Occupational Hygiene Branch

W W Staveley
Safety Coordinator
BC Telephone Company

Mr Rod Stratford
Safety Committee Representative
Local Lodge 863
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers

Mr Don Swiston
Health and Safety Chairman
Oakville and District Labour Council

Dermott Tait
Advisor
Construction Safety Association of Ontario

Mr Bob Todd
Business Representative
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local 1985

Mr Daniel Ublansky
Legislative and Health Co-ordinator
Energy and Chemical Workers Union

Mr Glen Weston
Industrial Hygiene
Stelco Inc

Mr Wayne Wetmore
Manager, Training and Development
Petroleum Industry
Training Service

Ms Alena Zelinka
Research Officer
Ontario Workers' Occupational Safety and Health Centre

READERS' NOTES